arXiv:1405.3819v1 [math.RA] 15 May 2014

# Principally Goldie*-Lifting Modules

Ayşe Tuğba Güroğlu * and Elif Tuğçe Meriç †

**ABSTRACT.** A module $M$ is called principally Goldie*-lifting if for every proper cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$, there is a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $X\beta^* D$. In this paper, we focus on principally Goldie*-lifting modules as generalizations of lifting modules. Various properties of these modules are given.

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010)**: 16D10, 16D40, 16D70.

**Keywords**: Principally supplemented, Principally lifting, Goldie*-lifting, Principally Goldie*-lifting .

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper $R$ denotes an associative ring with identity and all modules are unital right $R$-modules. $Rad(M)$ will denote the Jacobson radical of $M$. Let $M$ be an $R$-module and $N, K$ be submodules of $M$. A submodule $K$ of a module $M$ is called *small* (or superfluous) in $M$, denoted by $K \ll M$, if for every submodule $N$ of $M$ the equality $K + N = M$ implies $N = M$. $K$ is called a *supplement* of $N$ in $M$ if $K$ is a minimal with respect to $N + K = M$, equivalently $K$ is a supplement (weak supplement) of $N$ in $M$ if and only if $K + N = M$ and $K \cap N \ll K$ ($K \cap N \ll M$). A module $M$ is called *supplemented module* (*weakly supplemented module*) if every submodule of $M$ has a supplement (weak supplement) in $M$. A module $M$ is $\oplus$-*supplemented module* if every submodule of $M$ has a supplement which

*Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Muradiye, Manisa, Turkey.
e-mail : tugba.guroglu@cbu.edu.tr

†Celal Bayar University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Mathematics, Muradiye, Manisa, Turkey.
e-mail : tugce.meric@cbu.edu.tr

is a direct summand in $M$. [1] defines principally supplemented modules and investigates their properties. A module $M$ is said to be *principally supplemented* if for all cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$ there exists a submodule $N$ of $M$ such that $M = N + X$ with $N \cap X$ is small in $N$. A module $M$ is said to be $\oplus$-*principally supplemented* if for each cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$ there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $M = D + X$ and $D \cap X \ll D$. A nonzero module $M$ is said to be *hollow* if every proper submodule of $M$ is small in $M$. A nonzero module $M$ is said to be *principally hollow* which means every proper cyclic submodule of $M$ is small in $M$. Clearly, hollow modules are principally hollow. Given submodules $K \subseteq N \subseteq M$ the inclusion $K \overset{cs}{\hookrightarrow} N$ is called *cosmall* in $M$, denoted by $K \hookrightarrow N$, if $N/K \ll M/K$.

Lifting modules play an important role in module theory. Also their various generalizations are studied by many authors in [1], [4], [6], [7], [8], [9], [10] etc. A module $M$ is called *lifting module* if for every submodule $N$ of $M$ there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \subseteq N$ and $D' \cap N \ll M$. A module $M$ is called *principally lifting module* if for all cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$ there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \subseteq X$ and $D' \cap X \ll M$. G.F.Birkenmeier et.al. [4] defines $\beta^*$ relation to study on the open problem 'Is every $H$-supplemented module supplemented?' in [8]. They say submodules $X$, $Y$ of $M$ are $\beta^*$ equivalent, $X \beta^* Y$, if and only if $\frac{X+Y}{X}$ is small in $\frac{M}{X}$ and $\frac{X+Y}{Y}$ is small in $\frac{M}{Y}$. $M$ is called *Goldie*-lifting* (or briefly, $\mathcal{G}$*-lifting*) if and only if for each $X \leq M$ there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $X \beta^* D$. $M$ is called *Goldie*-supplemented* (or briefly, $\mathcal{G}$*-supplemented*) if and only if for each $X \leq M$ there exists a supplement submodule $S$ of $M$ such that $X \beta^* S$ (see [4]).

In Section 2, we recall the equivalence relation $\beta^*$ which is defined in [4] and investigate some basic properties of it.

In section 3 we define principally Goldie*-lifting modules as a generalization of lifting modules. We give some neccesary assumptions for a quotient module or a direct summand of a principally Goldie*-lifting module to be principally Goldie*-lifting. Principally lifting, principally Goldie*-lifting and principally supplemented modules are compared. It is also shown that principally lifting, principally Goldie*-lifting and $\oplus$-principally supplemented coincide on $\pi$-projective modules.

## 2 Properties of $\beta^*$ Relation

**Definition 2.1.** (See [4]) Any submodules $X, Y$ of $M$ are $\beta^*$ equivalent, $X\beta^*Y$, if and only if $\frac{X+Y}{X}$ is small in $\frac{M}{X}$ and $\frac{X+Y}{Y}$ is small in $\frac{M}{Y}$.

**Lemma 2.2.** (See [4]) $\beta^*$ is an equivalence relation.

By [[4], page 43], the zero submodule is $\beta^*$ equivalent to any small submodule.

**Theorem 2.3.** (See [4]) Let $X, Y$ be submodules of $M$. The following are equivalent:

(a) $X\beta^*Y$.

(b) $X \overset{cs}{\hookrightarrow} X+Y$ and $Y \overset{cs}{\hookrightarrow} X+Y$.

(c) For each submodule $A$ of $M$ such that $X+Y+A=M$, then $X+A=M$ and $Y+A=M$.

(d) If $K+X=M$ for any submodule $K$ of $M$, then $Y+K=M$ and if $Y+H=M$ for any submodule $H$ of $M$, then $X+H=M$.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let $M=D\oplus D'$ and $A, B\leq D$. Then $A\beta^*B$ in $M$ if and only if $A\beta^*B$ in $D$.*

*Proof.* ($\Rightarrow$) Let $A\beta^*B$ in $M$ and $A+B+N=D$ for some submodule $N$ of $D$. Let us show $A+N=D$ and $B+N=D$. Since $A\beta^*B$ in $M$,

$$M=D\oplus D'=A+B+N+D'$$

implies $A+N+D'=M$ and $B+N+D'=M$. By [[11], 41], $A+N=D$ and $B+N=D$. From Theorem 2.3, we get $A\beta^*B$ in $D$.
($\Leftarrow$) Let $A\beta^*B$ in $D$. Then $\frac{A+B}{A}\ll\frac{D}{A}$ implies $\frac{A+B}{A}\ll\frac{M}{A}$. Similarly, $\frac{A+B}{B}\ll\frac{D}{B}$ implies $\frac{A+B}{B}\ll\frac{M}{B}$. This means that $A\beta^*B$ in $M$. □

**Lemma 2.5.** *If a direct summand $D$ in $M$ is $\beta^*$ equivalent to a cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$, then $D$ is also cyclic.*

*Proof.* Assume that $M=D\oplus D'$ for some submodules $D, D'$ of $M$ and $X$ is a cyclic submodule of $M$ which is $\beta^*$ equivalent to $D$. By Theorem 2.3, $M=X+D'$. Since $\frac{X+D'}{D'}=\frac{M}{D'}\cong D$, $D$ is cyclic. □

# 3 Principally Goldie* - Lifting Modules

In [4], the authors defined $\beta^*$ relation and they introduced two notions called Goldie*-supplemented module and Goldie*-lifting module depend on $\beta^*$ relation. $M$ is called *Goldie*-lifting* (or briefly, $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting) if and only if for each $N \leq M$ there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $N\beta^* D$. $M$ is called *Goldie*-supplemented* (or briefly, $\mathcal{G}^*$-supplemented) if and only if for each $N \leq M$ there exists a supplement submodule $S$ of $M$ such that $N\beta^* S$. A module $M$ is said to be *$H$-supplemented* if for every submodule $N$ there is a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $M = N + B$ holds if and only if $M = D + B$ for any submodule $B$ of $M$. They showed that Goldie*-lifting modules and $H$-supplemented modules are the same in [[4], Theorem 3.6]. In this section, we define principally Goldie*-lifting module (briefly principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module) as a generalization of $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module and investigate some properties of this module.

**Definition 3.1.** A module $M$ is called *principally Goldie*-lifting module* (briefly principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting) if for each cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$, there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $X\beta^* D$.

Clearly, every $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. However the converse does not hold.

**Example 3.2.** Consider the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $Rad(\mathbb{Q}) = \mathbb{Q}$, every cyclic submodule of $\mathbb{Q}$ is small in $\mathbb{Q}$. By [[4], Example 2.15], the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Q}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. But the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathbb{Q}$ is not supplemented. So it is not $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting by [[4], Theorem 3.6].

A module $M$ is said to be *radical* if $Rad(M) = M$.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Every radical module is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* Let $m \in M$. If $M$ is radical, $mR \subseteq Rad(M)$. By [[11], 21.5], $mR \ll M$. So we get $mR\beta^* 0$. Thus $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let $M$ be a module. Consider the following conditions:*

*(a) $M$ is principally lifting,*

*(b) $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting,*

*(c) $M$ is principally supplemented.*

*Then $(a) \Rightarrow (b) \Rightarrow (c)$.*

*Proof.* $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ Let $m \in M$. Then $mR$ is cyclic submodule of $M$. From $(a)$, there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ with $D \leq mR$ and $mR \cap D' \ll M$. Since $D \leq mR$, $\frac{mR+D}{mR} \ll \frac{M}{mR}$. By modularity, $mR = D \oplus (mR \cap D')$. Then $\frac{mR}{D} \cong mR \cap D'$ and $\frac{M}{D} \cong D'$. If $mR \cap D' \ll M$, by [[11], 19.3], $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. It implies that $\frac{mR+D}{D} \ll \frac{M}{D}$. Therefore it is seen that $mR\beta^*D$ from Definition 2.1. Hence $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.
$(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ Let $m \in M$. By hypothesis, there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $mR\beta^*$ $D$. Since $M = D \oplus D'$ for some submodule $D'$ of $M$ and $D'$ is a supplement of $D$, $D'$ is a supplement of $mR$ in $M$ by [[4], Theorem 2.6$(ii)$]. Thus $M$ is principally supplemented. □

The following example shows that a principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module need not be principally lifting in general:

**Example 3.5.** Consider the $\mathbb{Z}$-module $M = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z}$. By [[10], Example 3.7], $M$ is $H$-supplemented module. Then $M$ is $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting by [[4], Theorem 3.6]. Since every $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting, $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. But from [[1], Examples 7.(3)], $M$ is not principally lifting.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let $M$ be an indecomposable module. Consider the following conditions:*

*(a) $M$ is principally lifting,*

*(b) $M$ is principally hollow,*

*(c) $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Then* $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (c)$

*Proof.* $(a) \Leftrightarrow (b)$ It is easy to see from [[1], Lemma 14].
$(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ Let $M$ be principally hollow and $m \in M$. Then $mR \ll M$ implies that $mR\beta^*0$.
$(c) \Rightarrow (b)$ Let $mR$ be a proper cyclic submodule of $M$. By $(c)$, there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. Since $M$ is indecomposable, $D = M$ or $D = 0$. Let $D = M$. From [[4], Corollary 2.8.$(iii)$], we obtain $mR = M$ but this is a contradiction. Thus $mR\beta^*0$ and so $mR \ll M$. That is, $M$ is principally hollow. □

We shall give the following example of modules which are principally supplemented but not principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.

**Example 3.7.** Let $F$ be a field, $x$ and $y$ commuting indeterminates over $F$. Let $R = F[x, y]$ be a polynomial ring and its ideals $I_1 = (x^2)$ and $I_2 = (y^2)$ and the ring $S = R/(x^2, y^2)$. Consider the $S$-module $M = \overline{x}S + \overline{y}S$. By [[1], Example 15], $M$ is an indecomposable $S$-module and it is not principally hollow. Then $M$ is not principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting from Theorem 3.6. Again by [[1], Example 15], $M$ is principally supplemented.

A module $M$ is said to be *principally semisimple* if every cyclic submodule of $M$ is a direct summand of $M$.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Every principally semisimple module is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* It is clear from the definition of semisimple modules and the reflexive property of $\beta^*$. □

Recall that a submodule $N$ is called *fully invariant* if for each endomorphism $f$ of $M$, $f(N) \leq N$. A module $M$ is said to be *duo module* if every submodule of $M$ is fully invariant. A module $M$ is called *distributive* if for all submodules $A, B, C$ of $M$, $A + (B \cap C) = (A + B) \cap (A + C)$ or $A \cap (B + C) = (A \cap B) + (A \cap C)$.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ be a duo module (or distributive module). Then $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting if and only if $M_1$ and $M_2$ are principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* ($\Rightarrow$) Let $m \in M_1$. Since $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting, there is a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$ in $M$. As $M$ is duo module $M_1 = (M_1 \cap D) \oplus (M_1 \cap D')$, $mR = (mR \cap D) \oplus (mR \cap D')$ and $D' = (M_1 \cap D') \cap (M_2 \cap D')$. We claim that $mR\beta^*(M_1 \cap D)$ in $M_1$. Since $\dfrac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{mR} \leq \dfrac{mR + D}{mR}$ and $\dfrac{mR + D}{mR} \ll \dfrac{M}{mR}$, we have $\dfrac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{mR} \ll \dfrac{M}{mR}$ by [[11], 19.3(2)]. From isomorphism theorem and the direct decomposition of $mR$

$$\frac{mR + (M_1 \cap D)}{M_1 \cap D} \cong \frac{mR}{mR \cap (M_1 \cap D)} = \frac{mR}{mR \cap D} \cong mR \cap D'.$$

Since $D'$ is a supplement of $mR$, $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. By [[11], 19.3(5)], $mR \cap D' \ll M_1 \cap D'$. Further $M_1 \cap D' \cong \dfrac{M_1}{M_1 \cap D}$. This shows that

$\frac{mR+(M_1\cap D)}{M_1\cap D}$ is small in $\frac{M_1}{M_1\cap D}$ and also in $\frac{M}{M_1\cap D}$. From Definition 2.1 we get $mR\beta^*(M_1\cap D)$ in $M$. Then $mR\beta^*(M_1\cap D)$ in $M_1$ by Lemma 2.4.

($\Leftarrow$) Let $m\in M$. If $M$ is a duo module, for cyclic submodule $mR$ of $M$, $mR=(mR\cap M_1)\oplus(mR\cap M_2)$. So $mR\cap M_1=m_1R$ and $mR\cap M_2=m_2R$ for some $m_1\in M_1$, $m_2\in M_2$ . Since $M_1$ and $M_2$ are principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting, there are decompositions $M_1=D_1\oplus D_1'$ and $M_2=D_2\oplus D_2'$ such that $m_1R\beta^*D_1$ in $M_1$ and $m_2R\beta^*D_2$ in $M_2$. By Lemma 2.4, $m_1R\beta^*D_1$ and $m_2R\beta^*D_2$ in $M$. Since $mR=m_1R+m_2R$, by [[4], Proposition 2.11], $mR\beta^*(D_1\oplus D_2)$. □

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let any cyclic submodule of $M$ have a supplement which is a relatively projective direct summand of $M$. Then $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* Let $m\in M$. By hypothesis, there exsists a decomposition $M=D\oplus D'$ such that $M=mR+D'$ and $mR\cap D'\ll D'$. Because $D$ is $D'$-projective, $M=A\oplus D'$ for some submodule $A$ of $mR$ by [[8], Lemma 4.47]. So $M$ is principally lifting. It follows from Theorem 3.4 that M is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let $M$ be principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting and $N$ be a submodule of $M$. If $\frac{N+D}{N}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{N}$ for any cyclic direct summand $D$ of $M$, then $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* Let $\frac{mR+N}{N}$ be a cyclic submodule of $\frac{M}{N}$ for $m\in M$. Since $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting there exists a decomposition $M=D\oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^*D$. Then $D$ is also cyclic Lemma 2.5. By hypothesis, $\frac{D+N}{N}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{N}$. We claim that $\frac{mR+N}{N}\beta^*\frac{D+N}{N}$. Consider the canonical epimorphism $\theta: M\to M/N$. By [[4], Proposition 2.9($i$)], $\theta(mR)\beta^*\theta(D)$, that is, $\frac{mR+N}{N}\beta^*\frac{D+N}{N}$. Thus $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let $M$ be principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*(a) If $M$ is distributive (or duo) module, then any quotient module of $M$ principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*(b) Let $N$ be a projection invariant, that is, $eN\subseteq N$ for all $e^2=e\in End(M)$. Then $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. In particular, $\frac{M}{A}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting for every fully invariant submodule $A$ of $M$.*

*Proof.* $(a)$ Let $N$ be any submodule of $M$ and $M = D \oplus D'$ for some submodules $D, D'$ of $M$. Then

$$\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D \oplus D'}{N} = \frac{D+N}{N} + \frac{D'+N}{N}.$$

Since $M$ is distributive, $N = (D+N) \cap (D'+N)$. We obtain $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D+N}{N} \oplus \frac{D'+N}{N}$. By Theorem 3.11, $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.

$(b)$ Assume that $M = D \oplus D'$ for some $D, D' \leq M$. For the projection map $\pi_D : M \to D$, $\pi_D^2 = \pi \in End(M)$ and $\pi_D(N) \subseteq N$. So $\pi_D(N) = N \cap D$. Similarly, $\pi_{D'}(N) = N \cap D'$ for the projection map $\pi_{D'} : M \to D'$. Hence we have $N = (N \cap D) + (N \cap D')$. By modularity,

$$M = [D + (N \cap D) + (N \cap D')] + (D' + N) = [D \oplus (N \cap D')] + (D' + N).$$

and

$$[D \oplus (N \cap D')] \cap (D' + N) = [D \cap (D' + N)] + (N \cap D') = (N \cap D) + (N \cap D') = N$$

Thus $\frac{M}{N} = \frac{D \oplus (N \cap D')}{N} \oplus \frac{D'+N}{N}$. By Theorem 3.11, $\frac{M}{N}$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

Another consequence of Proposition 3.10 is given in the next result.

A module $M$ is said to have the *summand sum property* (SSP) if the sum of any two direct summands of $M$ is again a direct summand.

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let $M$ be a principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module. If $M$ has SSP, then any direct summand of $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* Let $M = N \oplus N'$ for some submodule $N, N'$ of $M$. Take any cyclic direct summand $D$ of $M$. Since $M$ has SSP, $M = (D + N') \oplus T$ for some submodule $T$ of $M$. Then

$$\frac{M}{N'} = \frac{D+N'}{N'} + \frac{T+N'}{N'}$$

By modularity,

$$(D + N') \cap (T + N') = N' + [(D + N') \cap T] = N'.$$

So we obtain

$$\frac{M}{N'} = \frac{D+N'}{N'} \oplus \frac{T+N'}{N'}.$$

Thus $N$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting from Proposition 3.11. □

Next we show when $M/Rad(M)$ is principally semisimple in case $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module.

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let $M$ be principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting and distributive module. Then $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is a principally semisimple.*

*Proof.* Let $m \in M$. There exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^* D$. By [[4], Theorem 2.6$(ii)$], $D'$ is a supplement of $mR$, that is, $M = mR + D'$ and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. Then

$$\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{mR + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)} + \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

Because $M$ is distributive and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$,

$$(mR + Rad(M)) \cap (D' + Rad(M)) = (mR \cap D') + Rad(M) = Rad(M).$$

Hence $\frac{mR + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}$ is a direct summand in $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$, this means that $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is a principally semisimple module. □

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let $M$ be a principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting module and $Rad(M) \ll M$. Then $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is principally semisimple.*

*Proof.* Let $\frac{X}{Rad(M)}$ be a cyclic submodule of $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$. Then $X = mR + Rad(M)$ for some $m \in M$. There exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^* D$. By [[4], Theorem 2.6$(ii)$], $D'$ is a supplement of $mR$ in $M$. It follows from [[4], Corollary 2.12] that $(mR + Rad(M))\beta^* D$. Therefore

$$\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{X}{Rad(M)} + \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

By modularity and $X \cap D' \subseteq Rad(M)$,

$$\frac{X}{Rad(M)} \cap \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)} = \frac{(X \cap D') + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}.$$

Then we obtain that $\frac{M}{Rad(M)} = \frac{X}{Rad(M)} \oplus \frac{D' + Rad(M)}{Rad(M)}$.

□

**Proposition 3.16.** *Let $M$ be principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. If $Rad(M) \ll M$, then $M = A \oplus B$ where $A$ is principally semisimple and $Rad(B) \ll B$.*

*Proof.* Let $A$ be a submodule of $M$ such that $Rad(M) \oplus A$ is small in $M$ and $m \in A$. By hypothesis, there exists a decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $mR\beta^* D$. Then $D$ is cyclic from Lemma 2.5. By [[4], Theorem 2.6($ii$)], $M = mR + D'$ and $mR \cap D' \ll D'$. So $mR \cap D' = 0$ because $mR \cap D'$ is a submodule of $Rad(M)$. That is, $M = mR \oplus D'$. Hence $mR = D$. Since $D \cap Rad(M) = 0$, $D$ is isomorphic to a submodule of $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$. By Proposition 3.15, $\frac{M}{Rad(M)}$ is principally semisimple. Thus $D$ is principally semisimple. □

In general, it is not true that principally lifting and principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting modules coincide. As we will see the following theorem, we need projectivity condition.

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let $M$ be a $\pi$-projective module. The following are equivalent:*

*(a) $M$ is principally lifting,*

*(b) $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting,*

*(c) $M$ is $\oplus$-principally supplemented.*

*Proof.* $(a) \Rightarrow (b)$ follows from Theorem 3.4.
$(b) \Rightarrow (c)$ follows from [[4], Theorem 2.6($ii$)].
$(c) \Rightarrow (a)$ Consider any $m \in M$. From $(c)$, $mR$ has a supplement $D$ which is a direct summand in $M$, that is, $M = mR + D$ and $mR \cap D \ll D$. Since $M$ is $\pi$-projective there exists a complement $D'$ of $D$ such that $D' \subseteq mR$ by [[5], 4.14(1)]. Thus $M$ is principally lifting. □

**Proposition 3.18.** *Let $M$ be a $\pi$-projective module. Then $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting if and only if every cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$ can be written as $X = D \oplus A$ such that $D$ is a direct summand in $M$ and $A \ll M$.*

*Proof.* ($\Rightarrow$) Let $M$ be principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting and $\pi$-projective module. By Proposition 3.17, $M$ is principally lifting. Then for any cyclic submodule $X$ of $M$ there exists a direct decomposition $M = D \oplus D'$ such that $D \leq X$ and $X \cap D' \ll M$. By modularity, we conclude that $X = D \oplus (X \cap D')$.
($\Leftarrow$) By assumption and [[6], Lemma 2.10], $M$ is principally lifting. Hence from Proposition 3.17 $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

Now we mention that principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting and $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting modules are coincide under some condition.

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let $M$ be Noetherian and have SSP. Then $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting if and only if $M$ is $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* ($\Leftarrow$) Clear.
($\Rightarrow$) If $M$ is Noetherian, for any submodule $X$ of $M$ there exist some $m_1, m_2, ..., m_n \in M$ such that $X = m_1R+m_2R+...+m_nR$ by [[11], 27.1].Since $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting, there exist some direct summands $D_1, D_2, ..., D_n$ of $M$ such that $m_1R\beta^*D_1$, $m_2R\beta^*D_2$,...,$m_nR\beta^*D_n$. $D = D_1 + D_2 + ... + D_n$ is also a direct summand in $M$ because of SSP. By [[4], Proposition 2.11], $X\beta^*D$. Hence $M$ is $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

**Proposition 3.20.** *Let any submodule $N$ of $M$ be the sum of a cyclic submodule $X$ and a small submodule $A$ in $M$. Then $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting if and only if $M$ is $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting.*

*Proof.* ($\Leftarrow$) Clear.
($\Rightarrow$) Let $N = X + A$ for a cyclic submodule $X$ and a small submodule $A$ of $M$. Since $M$ is principally $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting, there exists a direct summand $D$ of $M$ such that $X\beta^*D$. From [[4], Corollary 2.12], $(X + A)\beta^*D$, that is, $N\beta^*D$. Hence $M$ is $\mathcal{G}^*$-lifting. □

# References


[1] Acar, U., Harmanci, A., *Principally Supplemented Modules*, Albanian Journal of Math., Vol 4, 3, (2010), 79-88.

[2] Al-Khazzi, I., Smith, P. F., *Modules with Chain Condition on Superfluous Submodules*, Comm. Algebra, 19(8), (1991), 2331-2351.

[3] Anderson, F.W., Fuller, K.R. *Rings and Categories of Modules*, Springer, New York, (1992).

[4] Birkenmeier, G.F., Mutlu, F.T., Nebiyev, C., Sokmez, N., Tercan, A., *Goldie*-supplemented Modules*, Glasgow Math. Journal, 52(A), (2010), 41-52.

[5] Clark, J., Lomp, C., Vanaja, N., Wisbauer, R., *Lifting Modules: Supplements and Projectivity in Module Theory*, Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, Switzerland (2006).

[6] Kamal, M., Yousef A., *Principally Lifting Modules*, Int. Electron. J.Algebra, 2, (2007), 127-137.

[7] Kosan, T., Tutuncu Keskin D., *H-supplemented Duo Modules*, Journal of Algebra and Its Applications, Vol. 6, No. 6, (2007), 965-971.

[8] Mohamed. S., Muller, B.J., *Continuous and Discrete Modules*, Cambridge University Press, (1990).

[9] Talebi, Y., Hamzekolaee, A.R., Tercan, A., *Goldie-Rad-supplemented Modules*, An. St. Univ. Ovidius Constanta, (2014).

[10] Yongduo, W., Dejun, W., *On H-supplemented Modules*, Comm. in Algebra, 40, (2012), 3679-3689.

[11] Wisbauer, R., *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory*, Gordon and Breach, (1991).